



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/505,173

02/10/2005

Vitalij Lissotschenko

A-9211

6686

7590

08/17/2006

Hoffman Wasson & Gitler
Crystal Center 2 Suite 522
2461 South Clark Street
Arlington, VA 22202

EXAMINER

FANG, JERRY C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2873

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/505,173

Applicant(s)

LISSOTSCHENKO ET AL.

Examiner

Jerry Fang

Art Unit

2873

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/31/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: Detailed Action.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-2 and 9-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kowarz et al. (US 2003/0086179).

Regarding claim 1, Kowarz discloses at least one modulation means (Fig. 1, 16) which can change at least in part the laser radiation (Fig. 1, 13) which passes through the modulation device, wherein the modulation device comprises beam splitter means (Fig. 1, 14) which can split the laser radiation into at least two component beams of radiation, that the device furthermore in the direction of beam propagation downstream of the beam splitter means comprises beam combining means (Fig. 4 and Para. 0023) which can recombine at least two of the component beams of radiation, and that at least one modulation means is located between the beam splitter means and the beam combining means such that at least one of the component beams can be changed by at least one modulation means such that the laser radiation which has been combined by the beam combining means or in an area of the beam combining means at least in a given area of space has the desired modulation as a result of the interference of at least two component beams (Fig. 1 and Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 2, Kowarz discloses wherein the laser radiation has at least in sections, in a first direction (Y) which is perpendicular to the middle direction (Z) of propagation, a greater divergence than in a second direction (X) which is perpendicular to the middle direction (Z) of propagation and to the first direction (Y), the separation in to component beams taking place in the first direction (Y) (Fig. 4 and Para. 0023).

Regarding claim 9, Kowarz discloses wherein the at least one modulation means are made as a modulator which is to be operated in transmission (Para. 0023).

Regarding claim 10, Kowarz discloses wherein the at least one modulation means are made as a two-dimensional modulator with which laser radiation which is incident on it can be modulated with respect to two directions which are essentially perpendicular to one another (Para. 0023).

Regarding claim 11, Kowarz discloses wherein an interferometer is formed by the beam splitter means (Fig. 1, 14), the modulation means (Fig. 1, 16) and the beam combining means (Fig. 4 and Para. 0023).

Regarding claim 12, Kowarz discloses wherein the direction (Z) of beam propagation downstream of the beam combining means there is a diaphragm which can

mask out parts of the laser radiation corresponding to the modulation which is to be achieved (Fig. 1, 22).

Regarding claim 13, Kowarz discloses wherein in the direction (Z) of beam propagation upstream and/or downstream of the diaphragm there are lens means, cylinder lenses which can focus the laser radiation onto the diaphragm and/or following the diaphragm can re-collimate the focused laser radiation (Fig. 1, 72 and 74).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kowarz et al. (US 2003/0086179) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hashimoto et al. (US 5,289,312).

Regarding claim 3, Kowarz, as detailed in claim 1 rejection above, fails to disclose wherein the beam splitter means are made as a prism or as an at least partially mirrored prism. Hashimoto discloses wherein the beam splitter means are made as a prism or as an at least partially mirrored prism (Col. 1 Line 50 – Col. 2 Line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to use prism as a beam splitter as taught by Hashimoto, with the optical device of Kowarz, since as shown by Hashimoto, a prism is commonly used in order to create a beam splitter.

Regarding claim 4, Kowarz, as detailed in claim 1 rejection above, fails to disclose wherein the beam splitter means are also made as a partially transparent mirror. Hashimoto discloses wherein the beam splitter means are also made as a partially transparent mirror (Col. 1 Line 50 – Col. 2 Line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to a partially transparent mirror as a beam splitter as taught by Hashimoto, with the optical device of Kowarz, since as shown by Hashimoto, a partially transparent mirror is commonly used in order to create a beam splitter.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kowarz et al. (US 2003/0086179) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Freedman et al. (US 3,676,866).

Regarding claim 5, Kowarz, as detailed in claim 1 rejection above, fails to disclose wherein the beam combining means are made as a prism, or as an at least partially mirrored prism. Freedman discloses wherein the beam combining means are made as a prism, or as an at least partially mirrored prism (Col. 3 Lines 26-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to use a prism as a beam combiner as taught by Freedman, with the optical device of Kowarz, since as shown by Freedman, a prism is commonly used in order to create a beam combiner.

Regarding claim 6, Kowarz, as detailed in claim 1 rejection above, fails to disclose wherein the beam combining means are made as a partially transparent mirror. Freedman discloses wherein the beam combining means are made as a partially transparent mirror (Col. 3 Lines 26-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a partially transparent mirror as a beam combiner as taught by Freedman, with the optical device of Kowarz, since as shown by Freedman, a partially transparent mirror is commonly used in order to create a beam combiner.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kowarz et al. (US 2003/0086179) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Amm (US 2002/0145806).

Regarding claim 7, Kowarz, as detailed in claim 1 rejection above, fails to disclose wherein the at least one modulation means can change at least one component beam of radiation such that it undergoes a concerted phase shift of at least one of its component rays, by half the wavelength of the laser radiation. Amm discloses wherein the at least one modulation means can change at least one component beam

of radiation such that it undergoes a concerted phase shift of at least one of its component rays, by half the wavelength of the laser radiation (Para. 0003). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the modulation means as taught by Amm, with the optical device of Kowarz, since as shown by Amm, such modulation means is commonly used in order to modulate light.

Regarding claim 8, Kowarz, as detailed in claim 1 rejection above, disclose wherein the at least one modulation means are made as a modulator which is to be operated in reflection (Para. 0023). Kowarz fails to disclose wherein the modulation means can be used as a GLV modulator. Amm discloses wherein the modulation means can be used as a GLV modulator (Para. 0012). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a modulator means as a GLV modulator as taught by Amm, with the optical device of Kowarz, since as shown by Amm, a modulator means is commonly used as a GLV modulator.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerry Fang whose telephone number is 5712726013. The examiner can normally be reached on 10-8.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Mack can be reached on 5712722333. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J.F.
8/10/2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Thompson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

TIMOTHY THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER